



Ecosystem Management Coordination CARA | Comment Analysis and Response Application

Response to Comment (By Author)

Project: Greater Prescott Trails Mid-Term Projects #2 (53205)

Comment Period: Scoping - scoping

Period Dates: 1/19/2018 - 2/18/2018 **Generated:** 11/21/2018 1:27 PM

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Anderson, Don	<p>I agree this trail and trailhead proposal will benefit the Prescott area. The addition of a trailhead or improvement of the existing that could handle the increase in users and usage is welcomed. With more user groups using the trails I believe the local community business will benefit from visitors and residents using the trails and increasing the likelihood of stopping in the area nearby to shop, eat and buy goods in the area.</p> <p>This plan makes total sense to me because in areas where they have closed trails users are forced to drive further or experience greater crowds because of the lack of areas nearby. With this plan it opens up greater opportunities to the outdoor experience that some of us love. Also with established and marked trails I believe users will remain on established trails and not be confused when a trail splits and there is no markings.</p>	We appreciate your support of the proposed trail plans.

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Anderson, Don	Currently I volunteer on a trail crew when I can and I am willing to volunteer to help on this project and help in its maintenance when necessary, so I am all in on this project!	Thanks you. We greatly appreciate the help of all our volunteers and partners; we couldn't do these projects without them.
Asel, Kyle	I would like to support this project going forward as more motorcycle trails are needed in the Prescott area. There have been numerous mountain bike trails built over the last 10 years without much being done for the OHV group. The OHV community will also volunteer time to help construct and maintain said trails in the future.	We appreciate the support for the action. This project is analogous to GPTP #1 project but for motorized trails.
Beauprey, Sarah	<p>This comment is about the plans in GPTP Midterm Project #2 Area B for the 50" wide trail (#0769).</p> <p>As a mountain biker I believe that this trail would make a great addition to our trail network. My main reason for this is that I would love to see some singletrack trails developed off of the undeveloped side of Sierra Prieta.</p> <p>Ideally it could be a great spot to introduce directional trails constructed with directional riding concepts incorporated in to the design. I've been riding here for a few years and absolutely love our trail network. One thing I have noticed when I compare riding here to other places is that often times when I encounter other trail users is that one of us or both or all of us has to move off of the trail to avoid eachother and my concern is that this causes unnecessary and undesired widening of trails. When I have ridden directional trails in other areas there is much less of this that occurs because the flow of traffic is much more consistent and conflicts are generally lessened and avoided. I would also like to add how much fun these are to ride as well as they offer an interesting type of flow and freedom that I know many mountain bikers look for in a good ride. I know I'm just one person but I</p>	We appreciate the support for trail 0769. The creation of directional mountain bike trails is outside the scope of this project as this project is focused on providing additional motorized trail opportunities.

Author(s)	Comment	Response
	believe many others likely feel the same as I do. I also believe that if a certain type of directional trail was introduced to our network that it could funnel mtn bikers to this area where they could experience more freedom thus creating a situation where they choose to go to areas where trails are optimized for this particular type of riding experience over trails that are more popular for hikers and equestrians. Thank you for taking the time to read my comments and I urge you to please consider the development in this area to include "Directional Trails" as part of your current plan or to be included in future developments.	
Cobb, Jenny	We concur with the Prescott National Forest in their efforts to make trail additions, reroutes and trailheads to the official trail system. We applaud your efforts today, and in the future, to maintain and move forward with trails all in the light of sound environmental and conservation practices - maintaining and restoring the natural ecosystem, for a sustainable future for our wild lands.	We appreciate your support for the proposed trails system. We try to balance the demand for a variety of recreational trails and opportunities with protecting our natural resources.

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Cobb, Jenny	<p>Non-Motorized vs. Motorized Trails. With Midterm Project #2 and Project #1, we count you are working on approx. 60 miles of non-motorized and 72 motorized miles. From the past almost 10 years of public multi-user meetings, what percentage of the public wanted non-motorized vs. motorized? We are assuming that the percentage of the public wanting non-motorized trails is higher than the OHV and motorcycle users.</p> <p>Motorized vehicles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Cause noise pollution that intrudes on the solitude of wild lands. * Are traveling faster than hikers/runners/horseback riders who must move quickly aside to avoid getting hit. * Cause the de facto closing of the myriad trails in the Seven Mile Gulch area because we wish to avoid motors. * Contribute to litter because some of these people must be litterers as we don't carry coolers with beer/soda cans, or cigarettes on the trails. Illegal fuel wood cutting and making donuts off trail around trees has been noted * <p>Come for off-road events (see Event Opportunities below). With new and/or updated trails you are inviting desert dwellers to the PNF - they were thrown out of the lower desert 25 years ago and began holding races in the Camp Wood/Cross U areas until the PNF was shamed into stopping them.</p> <p>It is our hope that the overall trail system in the PNF will tend towards non-motorized use and not 55% or more as illustrated by the first two mid-term projects.</p>	<p>This Midterm GTP #2 process has been designed to provide additional motorized trail opportunities analogous to the non-motorized opportunities planned and designed for in GTP #1. The public process for creating new trails of a certain type does not make decisions based on percentages of support for or against. Decisions in a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process are based on the analysis of potential effects to the environmental, social, and economic resources of a given land area and community within the context of various natural resource laws and policy. The forest recognizes that motorized recreation is a valid form of recreation under this policy and law that governs the management of forest lands and experience has shown that not providing opportunities for this type of recreation leads to unauthorized use such as what has occurred in the Sevenmile Gulch area for a number of years. It is the forest's belief that providing a better more connected motorized trail system will allow the impacts to non-motorized recreation to be managed and focused in compatible areas. The Prescott NF Trail system before the GTP midterm planning processes was 419 miles of motorized and 484 miles of non-motorized totaling 903 miles. With the recent authorization of the Verde Trails and Access Plan and the authorized but unbuilt trails in GTP #1 and assuming 61 miles of motorized trails from this GTP # 2 plan the forest's trail miles will be approximately 1,200 with 536 miles being motorized and 664 miles being non -motorized. An important element to consider in this is that motorized users cannot use non-motorized trails, but non- motorized users can use motorized trails. It is also notable that motorized users recreational needs can be met by the nearly 1,200 miles of level 2 forest service roads, which are open to non-motorized users but do not necessarily serve their recreational desires.</p>

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Cobb, Jenny	Education. We would like to see more education regarding trail/forest use for all types of users including campers and hunters in the form of trail signs and even articles in local media and on your Facebook page with information about carrying out trash, building and extinguishing fires, camping rules, safety and use of firearms, and what to do if you see an animal behaving oddly in daylight, or one dead	With this and other trail plans, the design and construction of additional trailhead facilities will allow us to provide better and more directed education and forest regulation information at these locations.
Cobb, Jenny	User Monitoring. Several years ago Jenny Cobb, as a volunteer, walked many PNF trails and filled out a form which noted whether the trail needed brushing, signage, closing, or other. We suggest that the PNF website have a downloadable/printable form available to trail users upon which they could make trail condition comments or suggestions. A blank form could be taken with you for on the trail notations; and/or upon return, submission to the PNF electronically via your website, email, or regular mail. The City of Prescott has such forms available for use at the Peavine trailheads. They are collected at regular intervals.	This is a valid suggestion and in recent years we have been collaborating with the City of Prescott and Prescott Trail Safety Coalition to provide this information as they have websites that gather this information.

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Cobb, Jenny	<p>Event Opportunities. In your scoping letter under economic stability, you list potential event opportunities. We hope this doesn't mean you are encouraging more events and will be closing the forest to the public for motorized events such as motorcycle, OHV's, or race car rallies. In 2016 we were on the Chino District collecting specimens from three sites on the Verde River which were time sensitive, needing to be delivered to a laboratory in Phoenix within four hours. We were stopped for a total of three hours at two road locations because of an automobile race. Our samples were finally delivered to the lab late at night and were no longer valid. This event and road closures were not announced in the newspapers or on the radio. We only saw a sign at "Williams Road" junction, on the east side, and some small paper notices attached to county road signs on adjoining, small, side roads to the Drake and Perkinsville Roads. We saw cars that had crashed as we made our way back to Chino Valley. In the past we have seen ORV races on the forest that were not only on the unpaved roads, but also traveling in washes and streams. Running events such as the Whiskey Row Marathon do not close the forest to other users.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The motorized event on the roads in the Chino Valley Ranger District is permitted on Yavapai County roads with cooperation of the Prescott NF and does have a press release every year for its occurrence.</p>
Cobb, Jenny	<p>Trail/Road Closures During Construction. We understand that there will be trails closed for construction. Please publish notice of trail closures and their re-opening to the public. After construction, please install new signage where necessary.</p>	<p>Trails that are under new construction are normally closed to protect user safety as the trail conditions during construction are not managed for use. Press releases are used when deemed appropriate.</p>

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Cobb, Jenny	Trail Maintenance. We are concerned that trail maintenance forest-wide has been in a state of benign neglect for the last 30 years and we are hopeful that new projects based on the outcome of the Greater Prescott Trails public meetings will rectify this situation.	Trail maintenance and volunteers have increased in the past 3 years on the Prescott NF. Maintenance has increased by 40 miles over 2017 levels and trails managed to standard by 100 miles over 2017 levels. Our trails and wilderness volunteer program is open to all.
Couch, Bonnie	<p>We trust that you will invite all trail users and other community partners to join in trail building, and maintenance and you will conduct monitoring to assure trail sustainability - environmentally, economically, and socially.</p> <p>I have recently heard about a new trail #0769 below Sierra Prietta. I would love to see a trail connecting Sierra Prietta down to the proposed 50" trail that would be considered a gravity trail with technical riding. As my sons grow older, their riding is progressing, we often travel to destinations that provide a challenge for them. I would love to see something more challenging here. We are blessed to have the Spruce mountain trails, Mingus Trails and the Dells. I believe that Sierra Prietta would be an amazing addition.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Gravity mountain bike trails are outside the scope of this project. A previous project, Greater Prescott Trails Planning Midterm Project #1, was for addressing non-motorized trails in the Prescott Basin area. This project, Greater Prescott Trails Planning Midterm Project #2 is for motorized trails planning.</p>

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Ezell, Cody	<p>Mapped area 0774 (Lady Bug) - The proposed re-route lower and to the north closer to Smith Ravine and Spruce mountain is concerning. The reroute would have riders of all formats running very close to private property and homes. The original Lady Bug trail (0774) puts riders closer to the south and southern part of the ridge. I understand that work will need to be done to decrease the incline and erosion of the trail. To be honest, the amount of rocks and ruggedness of the peak should keep erosion down. As an "A" rider Lady Bug is only 1 of 2 loops that require technical skills in the 7-mile area, Bigelow being the other. Keeping it on the southern side of the mountain will further reduce noise pollution for the homeowners Spruce Mountain Road, a positive in my opinion. Area Highlighted in green, map attached.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment. This trail location needed to be moved due to conflicts with threatened or endangered species habitat concerns.</p>
Ezell, Cody	<p>Mapped area 0779 - (Bigelow Peak) I'm not 100% sure this is an existing area but the one way up the hill seems very dangerous to riders, as it's not a continuous loop. Riders coming down off the peak could potentially have head-on accidents with other riders. Area highlighted in blue</p> <p>Is the original propose closed are to the south available for re-routing? This area is also 1 of 2 technical riding areas in the area.[...]Highlighted in red</p>	<p>Mapped area 0774 (Lady Bug) - The proposed re-route lower and to the north closer to Smith Ravine and Spruce mountain is concerning. The reroute would have riders of all formats running very close to private property and homes. The original Lady Bug trail (0774) puts riders closer to the south and southern part of the ridge. I understand that work will need to be done to decrease the incline and erosion of the trail. To be honest, the amount of rocks and ruggedness of the peak should keep erosion down. As an "A" rider Lady Bug is only 1 of 2 loops that require technical skills in the 7-mile area, Bigelow being the other. Keeping it on the southern side of the mountain will further reduce noise pollution for the homeowners Spruce Mountain Road, a benefit.</p>

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Ezell, Cody	- Mapped Area 0793 (Hidden Canyon) - This area was proposed originally as staying in the system. For an unknown reason, this area marked to be decommissioned. With a few re-routes in the lower creek beds, this trail would have no real reason for it's decommissioned. Hidden canyon and Lyon canyon (0794) share many of the same features. Map highlighted in yellow, but I'm not exactly sure I have it correctly marked.	Changes were made to reflect this comment and others received to do small reroutes to 793 trail where it was in the Stream Side management Zone and this trail alignment along with Lyon canyon has been added back to the system.
Ezell, Cody	Mapped Area 0792 and 0793 unknown name - This is a perfect access from the northern trail system and the southern system. Can be used as a route out if rider sustains injury. Can be used by beginners that are learning. Re-routes out of the lower laying creeks may be necessary. Highlighted in light blue	This trail segment has been added back to the proposed action.
Ezell, Cody	Benjamin Gulch great connector from the east to the west. Needs work on lower creek areas. Adds a route from the 0793 in the east to trail 0794 on the west. Highlighted in Magenta	Portions of 0794 have been added back into the proposed system with reroutes to address resource concerns for erosion and hydrology.

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Ezell, Cody	<p>Proposed <50 Inches - This addition seems unnecessary. To the east, the 299 and 9854 already give access to quads. Adding the addition of the interior 50" will open a Pandora's box. Increased accidents and widening of none 50" trails will hurt the 7-mile "single" track experience. I have been riding this area for more than 20 years. I can count on one hand the times I have seen a quad or side x side in this area. For the most part, this system has been known country wide as the best place in Arizona for single-track riding and I personally would like to keep it that way. I've personally been in a head-on with a side x side and to say the least, it wasn't pleasant. If removing the eastern, north to south route of 50" keeps single track riders from fast moving side x sides, I am for it. Side x sides should be treated as automobiles, there are thousands of forest service roads that can be used for side x side adventures and very little actual single track in the Prescott Basin.</p>	<p>The Hoot Owl trail 0745 was proposed in the GPTP #1 process to provide greater connectivity between the Blue Hills and Sevenmile Gulch Trail system and beyond. It is the intention to manage this trail as multiuse trail that encourages slower speeds and provides connection for a variety of users</p>
Griswold, Todd	<p>Overall I like the connectivity. I would like to see the 381/382 trails as motorized. I have never seen anyone else use these trails ever and we used to use them for connectivity to the southeastern trails like 306/319. We dont need the E&L portion from the ridge 70 to FR52 as we have Venesia.</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. This project seeks to provide additional motorized opportunity without reducing the opportunities for other users.</p>
Hatcher, Perry	<p>I would like to talk about environmental impact for a moment. I would like to submit to everyone that the single track in the seven mile gulch area has very little if any impact. Comparatively speaking. The history of this area started when miners claimed and dug into the earth using several methods that are clearly visible even today. These people had a special interest in the public land and they were the only ones that gained a benefit from it. Some of the public land was lost to the public when the minors patented their claims and kept the land for themselves. It was converted to private land and the</p>	<p>The past mining uses of the land during historic times does not allow the Forest Service to ignore current laws and regulations for the multiple use management of public lands. Furthermore, cattle grazing is a legitimate and legal form of multiple use that can and is managed concurrently with trail recreation in the rest of the Prescott NF. There is no reason to indicate that it cannot occur in the Sevenmile Gulch Area.</p>

Author(s)	Comment	Response
	<p>public lost any use of it. Many square miles of public land was lost this way. There was a major impact to the environment from these operations that we still suffer from today. We won't even go into the silts and chemical pollutants of these operations as that would be a whole different discussion. Then I believe the cattle industry came into the public lands. Ranchers leased the lands for their operations and there monetary benefits. There still was no regulations to their operations, these animals roamed where ever they pleased, eating any vegetation, crushing artifacts, causing erosion, cutting trails anywhere they and their ranchers pleased. Many cattle tanks were installed without any impact studies and are still here today even when the cattle are not. Again this was a huge impact that we still have today. Let's not go into the silts and chemicals that go along with these operations or the erosions and lost artifacts. Any discussion about OHV silts, riparian impact or resource damage is certainly trumped by these creatures. While we are on the subject of cattle the recent re-introduction of cattle to the 7 mile gulch area is nothing short of a slap in the face to the OHV users. If the plan is to leave these animals in the area I would recommend we scrap the whole 7 mile gulch project, the user conflict and liabilities should be very obvious. I for one am not willing to donate any of my time to maintaining trails that will be destroyed by and defecated on by cattle. Then comes along the logging industry, again special interest, some regulations, and massive destruction. Profits to be made from public lands again. Silts you bet, chemicals and oils on the lands you bet. They are allowed to traverse the country side with massive trucks wheel loaders and all other loggings equipment. Again they certainly trump any OHV use. Now we have the new kids on the block the Mastication family. Great for wild fire suppression, but again huge violators when it comes to</p>	

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Hatcher, Perry	<p>environmental impact, silts, fuels, oils, and erosion. Again any discussion about impact by OHV is trumped. I personally fail to see where single track OHV use on these very same lands can possibly be a contributing factor to any environmental impact. At least not on the scale of the other approved groups that I have mentioned above. I also believe these trails have many more contributing benefits to the forest than adverse ones. The OHV program benefits the public not just special interests, as all the others did, and do. We generate millions of dollars and hundreds if not thousands of donated man hours every year for these state and federal lands, putting back for the general good, not taking away. I would ask that everyone stop and consider these facts before they condemn the OHV community for violating the public lands.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. This GPTP#2 process proposes to increase the legal motorized trail system by 61 miles.</p>
Hatcher, Perry	<p>I think it's time to stop closing the legal trails to OHV use we have been pushed into a corner where the only thing left to ride is the unnumbered trails. There was very little if any conflict on these trails that have been closed to motorized, the only reason the trails were still there in many cases was because of motorized. I understand the need for some special use trails, but it seems the majority have been kicked out by the minority in many cases. Some more compromise would be nice with a more democratic process, public notices in the paper, on the radio, and a notice sign on the trails so all users would have a better chance of being counted and heard, before the trails are re-designated for special interests. I believe we deserve a voice in the stewardship of these Public, or what used to be public lands. Thank you for your consideration and for recognizing some of the impact that has been sustained by the motorized community.</p> <p>We really do appreciate what you are doing for us in the 7 mile gulch area</p>	

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Howard, Yuri	I'd first like to start with thanking our Forest Service for working so well with us and creating such a wonderful town to live in and raise our children. I'm a local now for 33 years and can say we are a very lucky community. I reside in Walker and am excited for the new trails we will see in Seven Mile Gulch and surrounding areas. My sons can't get enough of our great motorized trail system.	Thank you for your comments and your support of our trail planning efforts.
Howard, Yuri	<p>I'd like to express my interest in the possibility of a Trail connecting Sierra Prieta or possibly the West Spruce trail to the new 50" wide trail #0679. As a member sitting on the board for PMBA (Prescott Mt Bike Alliance)going on my third year, I think that this could be a great addition to the growing trail system our town is constantly developing. With Spence Basin soon being complete and new connectors leading to the Thumb Butte system. The proposed connecting trail would allow bikers to experience a whole new area. I volunteer regularly and understand the time and money that go into these projects and believe we will have both if we are given the chance.</p> <p>I also sit with the Prescott GravityTrails Coalition, and believe this could be a golden opportunity to build our first Mountain Bike one way directional trail. Being that it could be Gravity fed and directional, we could incorporate more natural features that would be more resistant against erosion and still optimize the gravity experience. Our community could benefit from trails such as these by lessening the potential of altercations with other user groups. This would also draw another demographic of riders who may not be looking at Prescott for an amazing riding experience.</p>	Thank you for your comments. New non-motorized or gravity trails are outside the scope of this process as this GPTP #2 process is intended to provide additional motorized trail opportunities.
Jenkins, Wade	I welcome the addition of trails and support it fully.	We appreciate the general support for the proposed action.

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Jenkins, Wade	<p>I believe it is a big mistake to limit the width of the trails to 50". Most side x side ROV units are 60" to 72" wide. These units would not be able to use the trail under this proposal. I would strongly suggest that the width be increased to 72" trail on the proposed ATV trails. 50" ATV 4 wheelers continue to decline in sales in favor of larger side x sides that are up to 6 seats. 50" ATV sales are down due to the inherit danger of the machines. Please know that by making the trail a mere 50" it would restrict a majority of ROV users. I own a ROV dealership and can speak with authority that 50" units are a thing of the past. I personally own the larger side x side units and would not be able to use a 50" trail. I would urge you to expand the trail size to 72" so that more trail riders can get out there with their families to enjoy our beautiful area.</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment. It is acknowledged that 50 inch and less ATV sales are on the decline and unfortunately, much of the motorized trail system in the Prescott NF was designed with this machine in mind for previous decades. Currently the terrain and equipment used for trail maintenance and construction would not be feasible to create a tread wider than 50 inches. The trail system being designed in this process is focused on providing opportunities for those vehicles that are not street legal and UTVs/ROVs are generally street legal and can use county and other roads to make critical connections between forest roads.</p>

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Johnson, Barrett	<p>the Prescott Trail Riders would like to thank you and all at the PNF for moving forward with this project in a timely matter.[...]As a local club representing approximately 130 members we have a keen interest in the successful resolution/ outcome of this project, while acknowledging that it is going to be an ongoing process continuing forward as needs require. This is really such a positive time to be proactive and engaged in this process with a collaborative relationship with the Prescott National Forest to take on a project of this scope in an area that we as a club, as well as many in the general population areas that come to recreate on these public lands with our OHV's, mountain bikes, hiking etc.. This is the great thing about these trails in that they will be open and accessible to all users; many can and will benefit from this proposal.[...]This project will solidify the legal opportunities in this area to travel in. As the overall driver of this project will be resource management, then the diverse OHV trail system, coupled with trail signage and user education, which would include appropriate wordage to reflect the peer purview of PTR and other groups to encourage all users to respect this unique area, accept it for what it offers and to " stay the trail ", then social and economic enhancements to the local community will naturally follow.</p> <p>The time and physical efforts and cost to get to this point have shown the commitment of the PNF and we feel that the proposed action as shown on the sub-areas reflects this forward thinking and actually the majority of what has been laid out really looks good as it reflects on the base premise of sustainable trails, connectivity of travel, variety of challenges etc</p>	<p>Thank you for your efforts and your support for these projects.</p>

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Johnson, Barrett	<p>we could accept the proposed overview as it stands, but the fact that we do represent such a variety of users, we also have some suggestions and solutions to make this area truly a world class project for now and into the future. So much of the ground work is in place or would be minimal for the initial rollout, i.e., Green gulch trail head, proposed new trail heads off of Walker Rd., short and long connectors in the other sub-areas that will piece together existing trails.</p> <p>We understand that a sustainable trail system built to standards allows for minimal maintenance requirements while protecting the watershed, and this will require trail planning, design, and building in some easy and challenging areas and that also will require a like commitment from us to assist in maintaining the trails that we would like to have in the "system", as they are important for trail connectivity, spreading out user impact, trail user safety and EMS support if needed. The suggestions are exactly that and it is expected that the solutions will require further due process as to their viability with regards to all applicable standards, walking the area with the PNF personnel etc. We sincerely appreciate the willingness of the PNF to listen and work with us on this project.</p>	<p>We appreciate your and your group's involvement in this process. We do strive to effectively balance the preferences of different user groups for the various types of opportunities with protecting the health and integrity of the natural resources.</p>
Johnson, Barrett	<p>On proposed trailheads, the standout at this time is the north one at Rd. 9401y, while it is at the top of the trail system it does have a good buffer from the Highlands Center, has adequate room for future expansion and require minimal work for start up. However it will require a few connectors, one with the proposed 745, a 50" trail, then a couple single track connectors going south/west to access the trail system.</p>	<p>We have added an additional connector for this TH in trail 0799.</p>

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Johnson, Barrett	Trail 782, Sawmill Gulch, uses existing roadbed, passes old mining artifacts (points of interest), has fun, technical climbs/drops and makes for interior loop connector to south, off of Ladybug trail. Will require reroutes for steep hill climb, erosion issues.	Portions of this trail have been added back into the system in the Draft EA.
Johnson, Barrett	Trail 783, Hidden Canyon, makes for a fun interior loop trail, combines technical hillside riding, has only a couple areas for erosion mitigation	This route has grades in excess of 30% and wildlife habitat issues, no feasible way to bring this trail into the system without complete redesign.
Johnson, Barrett	Trail 785, Old Miners Trail, another interior loop trail, has a couple POI, fun trail that's been there for awhile, but will require mitigation for erosion/steep areas.	Portions of this trail have been retained where it doesn't conflict with wildlife habitat or erosion issues.
Johnson, Barrett	Trail 792, 793, No Name Loop, will require extensive routing out of SMZ, but serves as an important connector, north/south, west of 745, and spreads user traffic.	This trail alignment has been added back into the proposed system with minor reroutes to address resource concerns.
Johnson, Barrett	Trail 784, Ruby Canyon, centrally located connector, possibly in lieu of adjacent section of 799, will require proper routing.	This trail has been added back into the proposed system as it creates logical loops with other trails in the area and has been shown to be sustainable in its current location.
Johnson, Barrett	Trail 799, through Benjamin Gulch and west of 745, should have an east/west connector in this area, important for spreading users around.	Portions of the Benjamin Gulch Trail have been added back into the system where it is on a sustainable old road bed. Further west portions remain proposed for decommissioning due to steep grades and hydrological impact concerns and replaced with new sustainable reroute to achieve same connection to trail 0794.
Johnson, Barrett	Trailheads-- limited choice here looks like the north one at Rd. 9401y, off of Walker Rd. While it is at the tip of the system it will require connector trail, a 50" to new proposed trail (745) and at least 2 more single track trails going west then south to connect with existing system routes. Has adequate room for future growth, will require minimal work for initial rollout.	Our intention is to balance the preferences of various user groups with resource protection.

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Johnson, Barrett	<p>Sub-area B-- Proposed 50" trail going across just below Sierra Prieta over look (0769) This will be a great connector with existing trails there.</p> <p>Proposed 50" connector 382, out of Ponderosa Park, under White Spar and link up to 260. A needed link for the system. See below</p> <p>Proposed 50" connector from existing 260 over to the Glen Oaks area. Another link for the future of the motorized "circle trail".</p> <p>Sub-area C-- proposed reroute of 50" track by Maverick Mtn. Will take care of trail damage etc.</p> <p>Sub-area D-- this is a large one, so starting in the north east section we have all positive proposals for connectors, cleaning up some issues from the Goodwin fire, dealing with excessive grades, and other actions to bring these trails up to standards.</p> <p>Proposed north connector 0773, from 354 over to junction of 43/9419 out of Green Gulch trail head.</p> <p>Reroute of 43 off of 42, eliminate the steep drop off, will have switchbacks down, gets more mileage of trail.</p> <p>Two sections of 9405 to reroute, clean up.</p> <p>Proposed 50" trail connecting Salida Gulch to under and west of Walker Rd. down to Bannie Mine Rd... This will be part of backbone for this area for access, trail connectivity, and link for outer loop.</p>	<p>We appreciate the general support for the proposed action, The proposed reroute of trail 064 near Maverick Mtn has been changed to full decommissioning for Trail #064 to reduce conflicts with threatened or endangered species habitat.</p>

Author(s)	Comment	Response
	<p>The remainder of the proposed trail system reflects the desire of the PNF to have a sustainable project with considering resource management, and PTR does support those trail reroutes and deletions etc as listed, having said that, we however take exception with several proposed trail closures and we need to be more specific on why. They are listed in no particular order and names given where applicable.</p> <p>Trail 782, Sawmill Gulch, uses existing roadbed, passes old mining artifacts (points of interest), has fun, technical climbs/drops and makes for interior loop connector to south, off of Ladybug trail. Will require reroutes for steep hill climb, erosion issues.</p> <p>Trail 783, Hidden Canyon, makes for a fun interior loop trail, combines technical hillside riding, has only a couple areas for erosion mitigation</p> <p>Trail 785, Old Miners Trail, another interior loop trail, has a couple POI, fun trail that's been there for awhile, but will require mitigation for erosion/steep areas.</p> <p>Trail 792, 793, No Name Loop, will require extensive routing out of SMZ, but serves as an important connector, north/south, west of 745, and spreads user traffic.</p> <p>Trail 784, Ruby Canyon, centrally located connector, possibly in lieu of adjacent section of 799, will require proper routing.</p> <p>Trail 799, through Benjamin Gulch and west of 745, should have an east/west connector in this area, important for spreading users around.</p>	

Author(s)	Comment	Response
McClellan, Dustin	Please keep difficult trails legal for advanced riders. The elimination of advanced trail from the Green Gulch area will be a loss. Many riders from all over the state and beyond travel here for advanced trails exactly like trail 43 I believe it is. Trails as such are no burden on the PNF. They're rider maintained and kept. "Sustainability " is never a good reason for altering or eliminating a trail that's existed before the word "sustainable" became the keys to eliminate.	The only reroute of trail 43 is the top section above Trail Tank where the trail goes straight up the fall line at 30% slope along the fence line. No changes are proposed for the truly unique and challenging sections of trail below Trail Tank.
Mohler, Derek	<p>The intent of this letter is to provide comment on GPTP Midterm Project #2 Area B where there is plans to build a 50" wide trail (#0769).</p> <p>On behalf of the Mountain Bike Population, I for one do fully support the development of the above mentioned 50" wide trail. My support comes directly from a standing that if the 50" wide trail is completed it would be most excellent if it would then allow development of single track trails leading down to this trail from many possible starting points along the ridge line occurring throughout Thumb Butte Road as it makes it journey up to the Sierra Prieta Overlook from Copper Basin Road and along to West Spruce Trail as it connects to West Spruce Mountain. This type of motorized/open access trail is precisely the type of return route that would be an excellent opportunity to allow the design and construction of "Directional" trails that our current trail network lacks and would greatly benefit from.</p> <p>While it is known that not all trail users follow suggested trail directions, there are numerous reasons to consider them in new trail projects. In some instances already existing trails have been turned in to Directional Trails with Downhill Travel as the suggested route and in some instances directional</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment. Gravity and directional mountain bike trails are outside the scope of this project. This project GPTP #2 is intended to provide additional motorized trail opportunities in the GPTP planning area.</p>

Author(s)	Comment	Response
	<p>climbing trails are effective as well although not as popular.</p> <p>Here are a few reasons that support the idea of directional trail use some of which are sighted from a USDA document from the Deschutes National Forrest.</p> <p>https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/deschutes/news-events/?cid=STELPRD3794485</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Increase Safety - by reducing the potential of user collisions.2. Reduce User Conflict - by reducing high-speed passing of walkers and runners.3. Provide better trail continuity - by reducing stopping when other users want to pass.4. Increase the feeling of solitude - by directing traffic to flow in the same direction the likelihood of encountering other users is lessened thus creating a more peaceful and secluded experience.5. Help to "Keep Single-track Single" - by reducing the need for users to go off trail to navigate past other users travelling in opposite directions thus reducing undesired impact and widening of trails.6. Allow for more challenging mountain bike rides- Directional trails allow riders to challenge themselves with fewer interruptions and reduced user conflict.7. Directional trails make forests more popular - by creating a	

Author(s)	Comment	Response
	designated area that excites mountain bikers and directs more user focus to those special areas.	
	8. Incorporation of Natural Terrain more effectively - by using design and construction techniques intended for directional traffic the use of Natural Terrain is more easily able to use to add to the texture and excitement of the trail.	
	After reviewing much of the terrain in the above-mentioned area concerning Sierra Prieta above what is to become #0769 it is hard not to acknowledge that this area would be ideal for incorporating the addition of directional trails in our forest. Here area few reasons why I believe this to be of interest.	
	1. As a new project, Trail #0769 once completed would serve as great return route to Copper Basin Road for trails that would connect with #0769.	
	2. This area has not yet been developed and at this stage in the process it would be an ideal time to incorporate a project like this into new or current plans.	
	3. With this as a new concept it should help to gather the interest of new volunteers who would seek out riding Directional Trails to come out and put in their time maintaining and building trails in addition to the already active volunteers.	
	4. Gather funding would be easier due to groups like the Prescott Gravity Trails Coalition (PGTC a subcommittee of P.M.B.A.- Prescott Mountain Bike Alliance) who already have money committed to going towards the development of Directional Trails on Sierra Prieta when and if approved. With	

Author(s)	Comment	Response
	<p>the amount of funding already set aside it should be easier to gather more funding once the conceptualizing of a project such as Directional Trails on Sierra Prieta are approved.</p> <p>5. The location is in an ideal spot due to its placement adjacent to the already established trail system from Copper Basin over to Thumb Butte. It is close enough to be reasonably accessible by mountain bikers however far enough away that other user groups would likely support its development.</p> <p>6. If Directional Trails are approved in this area it would lead to more mountain bikers selecting to ride there as opposed to some other trails that have a higher concentration of hikers and equestrians thus reducing user conflicts.</p> <p>I am aware you may find some of this information to be redundant however I want to push the topic in as positive of a way as possible. I am aware of how long much of this would take to be done properly and am eager to be a part of everything that I can do to help along in the process. Lastly, I urge you to please consider these ideas as part of your current plans or to be included in future plans. Thank you very much for taking time to consider these comments.</p>	
Peckham, Christopher	<p>I have Two areas of interest in the GPT mid-term project #2. First is the 50" trail proposed below Sierra Prieta overlook in area "B" I think this would be a great return trail to Copper Basin Road for technically difficult primarily down hill trails from the Sierra Prieta overlook. If this trail was designed in such a way that bicycle travel was reasonable and kept no wider than 50". It would Then make a great multi use trail. I hope that the forest service will consider the addition of one-</p>	

Author(s)	Comment	Response
	<p>way connectors from the top of Sierra Prieta down to this new trail. Seocond is the Seven Mile Gulch Area in area "D" I think that this area has great potential for the mountain bike community and the motorized community to come together and form some great technically difficult trails with good flow and possibly designate some of these trails directional.</p> <p>Directional trails are good because they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Increase Safety - by reducing the potential of user collisions.* Reduce User Conflict - by reducing high-speed passing of walkers and runners.* Provide better trail continuity - by reducing stopping when other users want to pass.* Increase the feeling of solitude - by directing traffic to flow in the same direction the likelihood of encountering other users is lessened thus creating a more peaceful and secluded experience.* Help to "Keep Singletrack Single" - by reducing the need for users to go off trail to navigate past other users travelling in opposite directions thus reducing undesired impact and widening of trails.* Allow for more challenging mountain bike rides- Directional trails allow riders to challenge themselves with fewer interruptions and reduced user conflict.* Directional trails make forests more popular - by creating a designated area that excites mountain bikers and directs more user focus to those special areas.* Incorporation of Natural Terrain more effectively - by using design and construction techniques intended for directional traffic the use of Natural Terrain is more easily able to use to add to the texture and excitement of the trail.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Directional mountain bike trails are outside the scope of this project. This project GPTP #2 is intended to provide additional motorized trail opportunities in the GPTP planning area. The creation of directional motorized trails in the Sevenmile Gulch area is a valid suggestion. The proposed trails in this plan will all be managed for dual directional use. On the surface, users and managers may think that one-way trails will reduce conflict and improve safety on trails for motorized users, but a review of the literature shows that overwhelmingly this leads to a false sense of security as users will travel faster on these trails. Possible safety concerns include changing trail conditions, stopped users, users with mechanical issues needing to return on a one-way trail, and lastly missing or inadequate signage (Crimmins 2006, Dufourd 2015). See the trails specialist report for more information.</p>

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Powell, Randy	<p>The purpose of this letter is three fold: A: to comment of the February 5 meeting B: to comment on "illegal" trails and C: to make a suggestion on the heavy fuel load around the Granite Basin Lake area .</p> <p>A. When you call a meeting for public input, and start by stating that the purpose of the meeting is to find out what the public wants in the way of motorized trails in the area and state that you want our input, you should not let one of the presenters cut off a questioner and then say that you needed to spend the time to talk about what you came here to say. If you want input, stop talking and start listening.</p> <p>When I left the meeting, disgusted as I have ever been, Jason very politely came out with me to try to explain things. Thank you Jason. The other presenters evidently did not share Jason's intent.</p> <p>B. The next day I called a friend in attendance who stayed the entire time and asked him what happened after I left. He said it was the "same old, same old" stuff the forest service has been spouting to us for years. No answer as to why you keep closing our trails to motorcycles, then pat yourselves on the back when you propose opening some new motorized trails out in the middle of nowhere.</p> <p>Also, what is this with the constant reference to "unauthorized" or "illegal" trails? You sounded proud of your organization for imposing some heavy fine on someone who built some trail you did not approve ahead of time. Maybe you need to give out fines to the cows and wild game in the forest because they make trails. When we started riding dirt bikes 50 years ago we called it "cow trailing" because that's where we</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We regret that the process does not feel genuine to you. We disagree with your opinion of trails being proposed in the middle of nowhere as many of the 61 miles of new trail in this plan can be accessed within 5 miles of downtown Prescott, 30+ miles of which are about 1 mile from Costco. If the proposed action in this plan is authorized, the Prescott NF will have 536 miles of motorized trails combined with 1,200 miles of level 2 roads for non-street legal users to enjoy.</p>

Author(s)	Comment	Response
	<p>rode - on cow trails. The phrase "single track" did not exist.</p> <p>My wife and I went to the Granite Basin lake area two days after your meeting to walk the 261 trail. We had not been out there for years. You need to go out there and check out the miles and miles of "unauthorized" or "illegal" trails that have been pounded down by hikers and bicycles, not motorcycles, going from point A to point 8. I don't see any forest personnel out there giving tickets to hikers for making these "illegal" trails. What is the difference between hikers walking and bicycles riding an area that "makes a new trail" and a motorcycle doing the exact same thing? Your personnel seems more interested in being "cops of the wood" than servants of the public. What is the basis of your bias against motorized vehicles? Why do you impose different rules for motorcycle than the hikers and bicycle people?</p> <p>We walked the Pevine trail the a few weeks ago and there are branching "illegal" trails (by your definition) everywhere made by hikers and bicycle riders. The same thing exists around Willow Lake. Go out to the Timberidge housing area on Copper Basin and walk south toward Wolverton and Quartz mountains where hikers and bicycles have created unapproved "illegal" trails everywhere. Are you giving violation citations to these users like you have sited some motorcycle rider? You sounded proud of yourselves for 11catching" some motorcycle rider who built an "illegal" trail, but you don't even consider what the hikers and bicycle riders have been doing for years as "illegal". Is this not a double standard? None of these people need be sited. Your focus is clouded on the side of enforcement, not service and reasonable access.</p>	

Author(s)	Comment	Response
	<p>If you want to do your job of being an enforcer why don't you go up Copper Basin road to Trail 54 some Friday or Saturday night and arrest all the teenagers who go there to do underage drinking and smoking pot. I go up there on Sundays, pick up trash and have found still burning Saturday night fires, broken glass everywhere and even an abandoned, parted out motorcycle left beside the fire. You better take a few Sheriff Deputies with you when you go.</p> <p>C. One last thing. The Forest Service needs to go to the Granite Basin Lake area and start some brush clean up. The area is chocked with 11fire fuel" to an extremely dangerous level. We almost lost that area a few years ago and yet it is still fuel heavy. The Forest Service and fire agencies have been promoting 11defensible space" around homes for several years now. I spent over \$1,000 a few years ago to hire handymen to clear brush around my cabin. You should follow your own suggestions for the Granite Basin Lake area. Even though there are no homes there, remember what happened in Yarnell. Fires have a tendency to get out of control and travel fast when there is a heavy fuel load in an area that is hard to get to like the wilderness area going up Granite Mountain.</p>	
Reeves, Ken	Please provide clarification in the proposed action section for the sentence "All ATV designed trails would be considered multiuse and allow use by all other motorized and non-motorized users." This sentence implies that any motorized vehicle can use the trail, including full-sized vehicles (e.g. Jeeps). I do not believe that this is the intent.	The statement has been corrected to read "All ATV designed trails would be considered multiuse and allow use by all other motorized and non-motorized users with vehicles under 50 inches wide."

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Shumaker, John	I'm interested in seeing directional (1 direction) gravity fed trails going off of Sierra Prietta near the Overlook and connecting with a soon to be built motorized trial in the Copper Basin.	Thank you for the comment. Gravity and directional mountain bike trails are outside the scope of this project. This project GPTP #2 is intended to provide additional motorized trail opportunities in the GPTP planning area.
Spangle, Steven	<p>The Mexican spotted owl (<i>Strix occidentalis lucida</i>) is known within the project area and nine Protected Activity Centers (PACs) are designated within the action area that could be affected by the proposed action. Critical habitat for the owl is also designated within the project area.</p> <p>According to project maps and a map sent to us via electronic mail on January 29, 2018, and included in the EA, there appear to be several new trails proposed in many of the owl PACs. We recommend that you clearly identify the trails that are current, unauthorized trails that will become designated trail, those trails that are proposed for new construction, and what specific trails would be decommissioned. We also recommend that you include some measure and description of what the current recreational use on these trails is and how use may change as a result of this project, particularly within the PACs and critical habitat.[...]The Recovery Plan for the Mexican spotted owl (USFWS 2012) recommends avoiding the construction or designation of new trails in PACs. We recognize that many of these non-system trails that exist on-the-ground are being used regularly; however, this project provides an opportunity for us to work together to minimize the effect of designating and/or constructing trails, especially motorized trails, within the PACs that may result in disturbance to breeding owls, and even abandonment of nesting areas, due to recreational activities. We recommend working with us and the intended user groups to determine how we can reduce and/or remove proposed trails from within</p>	After further review of the proposed action and reference to various habitat layers, all proposed trails have been removed from Protected Activity Centers (PACs) and one existing system trail will be decommissioned where it previously was in a PAC.

Author(s)	Comment	Response
	the PACs to minimize effects to spotted owls. We recommend trails that are decommissioned be completely removed or rehabilitated to a natural state to avoid further use, especially in PACs. Closing trails only at the trailhead can still allow for public use, which can lead to the same potential effects to owls as described above.	
Spangle, Steven	We appreciate your coordination with us on this project and we look forward to working with you to minimize effects of the action to Mexican spotted owls and their habitat. We also encourage you to coordinate the review of this project with the Arizona Game and Fish Department.	Forest Service will continue to work closely with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Arizona Game and Fish Department.
Teisl, Philip	I want to thank the PNF for this opportunity to comment on the scoping plan for the Prescott Basin OHV travel plans. I support all of the trail mitigation issues/plans shown for the sub-areas with comments and exceptions as noted below.	Thank you for your involvement and support for this project.
Teisl, Philip	Regarding the proposed trail heads for area D, I believe that the north one located at Fr. 9401y will work well, it is far enough away from the Highlands Center, but it is at the tip of the trail system so it will require a 50" connector to the proposed 745 trail, and then a couple single track connectors to the south and west to access the trail system, but it offers room for future expansion as needed, and the terrain is suitable for use with minimal initial construction.	The plan did add an additional single track trail leaving this TH to help alleviate congestion.
Teisl, Philip	In sub-area B the proposed 50" trail going across just below Sierra Prieta ,0769, will make a great connector to the other existing routes there, as well as proposed 382 out of Ponderosa Park, under White Spar and link up to 260 , then continue the connection over to Glen Oaks. These additions will be a necessary part of the motorized "circle trail" concept.	We appreciate your general support for the proposed actions.
Teisl, Philip	Sub-area C, the reroute of 50" trail also is needed for erosion and damage issues.	We appreciate your general support for the proposed actions.

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Teisl, Philip	Sub-area D, the proposed north connector (0773) will make a much needed connector at the top of the area that will go to junction of 43/9419 to give users a choice to cross the ridge, spreading out usage in the area with access to the trail head at Green Gulch. The reroute of 43 that drops off of 42 to eliminate the steep incline causing severe erosion will hopefully be replaced with a longer trail with switchbacks to get to the bottom, and also be a safer route going back up, along with increased trail mileage. The sections of 9405 should also have the proposed work done to them to restore the trail to standards.	We appreciate your general support for the proposed actions.
Teisl, Philip	The proposed 50" trail, from Salida Gulch to under Walker Rd. and weaving it's way down west of Walker rd. to Bannie Mine Rd. will be a backbone of the trail system through out the seven-mile area for trail connectivity, access, link for outer loop etc. That combined with reroutes of 9854 will be likewise another backbone of the system with it's strategic location to access loops, one of the few motorized trails to access 299 and over to the Senator Hwy., it will help spread users out, and offering possible EMS support access.	We appreciate your general support for the proposed actions.

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Teisl, Philip	The following trails have a historic use with some of the mining use some years ago, and others are social trails that obviously were not built with anything sustainable in mind, but they do have a significance in that they have an interior routing for the system that serves it well, but will require a closer inspection as to their viability of being rerouted totally or some sections could be mitigated to help bring to spec.	The lower portion of the sawmill gulch trail is completely within the Stream Management Zone having negative impacts on hydrology and the upper conflicted with wildlife habitat concerns, so this unauthorized trail was not included in the proposed action. The hidden canyon Trail 783 was not feasible to retain primarily due to grades exceeding 30%. A portion of the Old Miners Trail 785 was retained in the proposed system, but further south portions had conflicts with wildlife habitat. Trails 792 and 793 were added back to the proposed system with reroutes to address hydrologic concerns and Ruby Canyon trail 784 was also added back into the system as it was found to be sustainable. Lastly, a portion of the Benjamin Gulch trail was retained and reroutes to access Lyon canyon were added to address resource concerns on the old alignment that was in the stream course.
	Trail 782, Sawmill Gulch.	
	Trail 783, Hidden Canyon.	
	Trail 785, Old Miners Trail	
	Trail 792,793, No Name Trail	
	Trail 784, Ruby Canyon	
	Trail 799, through Benjamin Gulch, west of 745 could be important east/west connector	

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Young, Derek	As a hiker, biker, and especially a motor user, there are numerous exciting aspects to it. Area B: 0769 would be a fantastic motored connector. It would be nice if it were wider to accommodate the larger side by sides that are popular these days. I'm quite sure the roads at either end can be accessed with larger vehicles as well. Personally I see a lot of potential for use in conjunction with the primary mountain bike trail with which the Prescott Gravity Trails Coalition has shown strong interest in. It would seem that this 769 could also be used by bikers returning to Copper Basin Rd after completing any future conceptual segment down from the top at Sierra Prietta overlook and would provide passage for about 2/3 of the length of PGTC's Sierra Prietta concept trail greatly accelerating a useable, connected, premiere gravity trail.	Thank you for your general support. Creating trails wider than 50 inches in our trail system is not economically feasible at this time due to the terrain and type of equipment used to construct new trails. This plan is intended to address motorized trail recreation opportunities and non-motorized trails outside the scope of the project.
Young, Derek	Area C: 0770 is sorely needed since the private ownership cut off this connector several years back. I like the 260 extension as well. It keeps one from having to use the highway and that is fantastic. I enjoy 0065 as it currently exists myself complete with its' challenges. Can you consider just altering it for better drainage/sustainability instead of a full reroute? The map and key are a bit difficult to read but the 382 extension looks awesome as well.	Thank you for the general support of the proposed action. Trail 65 has been proposed for decommissioning due to conflicts with wildlife habitat.

Author(s)	Comment	Response
Young, Derek	<p>Area D: I remember 9405 being brushy and difficult to follow so improvement to it sounds great. 0773 looks like a real nice trail. Sorry, I'm running out of superlatives, as you can tell I am highly in support of just about everything proposed, good job PNF! Seven Mile Gulch: I don't know the trails there very well, I have only mountain biked them a couple of times but I find it tremendously exciting that all of these new trails could be constructed/adopted, I support what ever the PTR people are endorsing, and greatly look forward to motoring them some day. I see how a lot of work has been put into this, thank you again staff of the PNF! [...]Area C: Proposed Jeep Trail in upper center. I fully support this as I'm the one who suggested it lol. But seriously, it provides another excellent connector allowing a motored user to stay on the trail and off the pavement. I should think it's very short length would be a plus as well in construction and keeping costs low.</p>	<p>We appreciate you support of the proposal and your involvement in the process.</p>